

## REMARKS

The Examiner has rejected claims 17 and 18 under 35 USC 102(e) as being anticipated by Shin (US 2003/0086214). Both claims 17 and 18 recite a damped flexible circuit, “wherein the vibration damping material is configured to be relatively wider in areas wherein more damping is required and relatively narrower elsewhere.”

The Examiner asserts that Shin teaches such a damped flexible circuit, wherein the vibration damping material is configured to be relatively wider in areas wherein more damping is required and relatively narrower elsewhere. The Examiner points, for example, to Fig 4 of Shin.

However, upon inspection of the Shin reference, it can be seen that Shin does not teach a damped flexible circuit wherein the damping material has a width that changes at all. For example, Fig. 4 of Shin shows a flexible circuit having two rectangular shaped layers of damping material (40), one located at each end of the flexible circuit. Furthermore, a careful inspection of Shin reveals that Shin does not teach or suggest anywhere that the width of the damping layer can be varied based on damping needs. Because the references do not teach every element of claims 17 and 18, these claims are not anticipated under 35 USC 102 and are, therefore, allowable over the prior art. Because claims, 2-4, 6 and 7 depend from claims 17 and 18 and add further limitations thereto, these claims are also allowable over the prior art.

Furthermore, claim 6 recites that the damping material covers an area at least  $\frac{1}{3}$  the area of the flexible cable and claim 7 recites that the damping material covers an area at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  the area of the flexible cable. The Examiner has asserted Shin teaches that the damping material covers an area at least  $\frac{1}{3}$  or at least  $\frac{1}{2}$  of the flexible cable. Close inspection of Shin, however, reveals that Shin does not teach this. For example, in Fig. 4, Shin shows the damping material (40) covering only a small percentage of the area of the flexible cable. Fig. 4 shows that the damping material (40) is configured as only a small rectangular strip at either end of the flexible cable (41). Figs. 6A-6C of Shin show a cross section of the flex cable shown in Fig. 5, which again shows the damping layer (40) being a thin rectangular strip that comprises a very small percentage

of the cable (41). Similarly, Fig. 7 shows the damping layer (40) being a narrow rectangular strip that covers a small portion of the total flex cable (41). Therefore, claims 6 and 7, in addition be being dependent upon allowable claims 17 and 18 recite further elements that are not taught by the prior art, and are, for these additional reasons, further allowable over the prior art.

The Examiner has also rejected claims 10, 11 and 12 as being anticipated under 35 USC 102(e) in view of Shin. Each of claims 10, 11 and 12 recite a device having a damped flexible cable wherein the vibration damping material is configured with relatively wider portions where additional damping is needed and relatively narrower portions elsewhere. As discussed above, Shin does not teach a device where the width of the damping material varies. Because the prior art does not teach all of the elements of claims 10, 11 and 12, these claims are allowable over the prior art.

The applicant sincerely believes that all of the Examiner's objections and rejections with regard to all of the remaining claims have been addressed, and that the claims remaining for prosecution in this case are allowable. The Applicant, therefore, respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance.

For payment of any fees due in connection with the filing of this paper, the Commissioner is authorized to charge such fees to Deposit Account 50-2587 (Order No. SJ092000001US1).

Respectfully submitted,

By: /Ronald B. Feece/  
Ronald B. Feece  
Reg. No. 46,327

Date: February 15, 2007

Zilka-Kotab, PC  
P.O. Box 721120  
San Jose, California 95172-1120  
Telephone: (408) 971-2573  
Facsimile: (408) 971-4660